

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Proverbs 28: 20: *A faithful man shall abound with blessings.*

Almighty God, we earnestly beseech Thee that our life may be more faithfully and firmly rooted in the spiritual realities. May our character and conduct be brought into close and cordial harmony with the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine Spirit.

We humbly confess that our attitudes and aspirations are frequently selfish and self-centered, as we face a world that has so many desperate needs and longings.

Grant that all the Members of this Congress may bear witness in their personal life to the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES IS IN A TRAGIC SITUATION

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it took many years, before Nero fiddled while Rome burned but I am sorry to say that it has taken President John F. Kennedy only a short time after his speech on January 20, 1961, not only to place our country in one of the worst domestic messes it has ever been in, with his tax reduction and tax reform phony programs, but our country, in its foreign policy, has never been in worse shape in its history. I can remember the time when we have been in trouble with our enemies, and that is natural. But today we are knocking off our friends. Today we are making enemies of our friends. Today we are disenchanting our friend to the north; we are disenchanting our friends in England and trying to run General de Gaulle. Just where are we going with that kind of a backward policy, I shall never know. I only say that it is a tragic thing for my country.

OUR PRESENT SITUATION

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the fact that Members oftentimes use the well for political purposes. I know that that has been going on for a long time and I make no complaint about it. But I would say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] has just engaged in an exaggeration, to use a very polite way of describing his remarks. No. 1: the domestic situation in our country.

The gross national product in the last quarter of 1962 reached its 'highest point in the history of the United States of America. Corporate profits hit a new record. Money available to the general public hit a new record.

This does not mean that we do not have problems. We do have them and I frankly admit there are problems in our economy. The President is facing up to them, as the gentleman from New York knows. What program, if any, has the gentleman proposed? Whatever it is, he has succeeded in keeping it a secret.

Turning to the situation our country finds itself in internationally. I have never seen an administration which has handled itself with more restraint. The notion that we have done anything to alienate our neighbors to the north is not correct. The notion that we have alienated Great Britain is not correct. As a matter of fact Prime Minister Macmillan met with the President of the United States in the West Indies not long ago and it was a most cordial and fruitful meeting.

The problems of the world in which we live do not lend themselves to easy solutions. I regret the speech of the gentleman. I say to him that we have a dedicated President who understands these problems and who does his homework so that our country will remain free, strong, and at peace. It is very easy to be critical. It is harder to be constructive. I would hope we would approach these problems in a nonpartisan spirit rather than a political spirit.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from California's yielding. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that it is not unusual when a Republican stands on the floor who believes in his country and thinks the situation facing the United States is tragic and then is accused of being political. I would say the gentleman from Louisiana should be the last one to accuse a Republican on this floor of being political, because for 10 years I have heard him time and time again make political attacks on the Republicans on this floor. My attack was not political. My attack was on behalf of my country. You talk about the gross national product, but when you deduct \$100 billion of Federal spending, the gross national product looks as phony as a \$3 bill. Further, the ridiculous tax reduction proposal of the President—what he is proposing is that the Government borrow \$12 billion from the people and then give them a tax cut. However, in the second proposal for tax reform, he is going to take the tax reduction away from the low- and middle-income families and make them pay more taxes than ever before. I remember the New Deal and Fair Deal policies of tax and tax and spend and spend, but President Kennedy has introduced a new gimmick. Spend and spend, build bigger and bigger deficits, push the national debt into orbit and reduce taxes, or try to make it look like reducing taxes. Believe me, from my mail and talking to my people back home, they are not being fooled one little bit.

CUBA

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Bay of Pigs we have watched

1742

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 5

today's decisions on Cuba turn into tomorrow's dilemmas. Confusion and contradiction are keywords.

The United States, the most powerful military and moral force in the world, apparently is hypnotized into immobility while an island in the Caribbean balloons into a major threat to our national security.

Are we to assume that our Government is prepared to permanently accept a Soviet bastion just 6 jet minutes from Miami?

Are we going to resign ourselves forever to the presence of a pesthole of Soviet propaganda, subversion, and infiltration just 90 miles from our shore?

Or are we going to face the fact that the Soviets are pouring money, men, and military hardware into Cuba with one goal in mind: the ultimate subjugation of the Western Hemisphere?

Communist Cuba threatens the security and domestic tranquility of the Americas. The American people have a right to know what their Government intends to do.

To that end, and to put a halt to the confusion, contradiction, and speculation which is causing unrest among our Latin American neighbors and lack of confidence at home, I am today introducing a new resolution. It encompasses my House Concurrent Resolution 51, introduced on January 24, to investigate the entire Bay of Pigs episode, and adds the provision that a special joint committee be empowered also to investigate the operations of all our intelligence-gathering agencies.

The past and present situation in Cuba demands it.

U.S. CITIZENS IMPRISONED IN CUBA

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 of this year I directed a letter to Secretary Dean Rusk of the Department of State, as follows:

Since the release of the Cuban prisoners, little if anything has been said about what is happening to the 23 U.S. citizens who are imprisoned in Cuba. Will you please advise me as to what is being done toward securing the release of our own citizens from Mr. Castro's jails.

I would like to report to the House that up to date I have received no reply to this letter. I am not terribly surprised, knowing the difficulties with which the State Department is laboring in all parts of the world, but at least I thought I might get a reply stating that the Department of State is seriously concerned about the imprisonment of our own citizens by Castro.

It does seem strange that millions of dollars of tax-free money can be raised within a few hours to ransom the Cuban prisoners but nothing can be done about our own citizens.

It must be extremely galling to the Marine Corps, whose fine history dates back to the shores of Tripoli, to have to sit idly by while we ransom prisoners from the pirate Castro.

While the administration officials are doubletalking the Cuban situation, either our own Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs should get at the bottom of this powder keg 90 miles from our shores.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS VIEWS ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have offered the papers of several experts on the subject of nuclear test ban negotiations which have been collected by the Republican conference committee on that subject. Following are the views expressed by Mr. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in response to inquiries:

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Strauss, when you were Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission you opposed the moratorium on atomic weapons testing then. As I very well recall, you warned that the Communists would drag the negotiations along for years; that during these negotiations, they would probably cheat by conducting their own underground testing clandestinely and that they would abrogate the moratorium when they felt like it by testing in the atmosphere. Even worse, you feared that they would thus gain on us. Unfortunately, what you predicted came to pass. What is your view in the present situation now that negotiations have been reopened?

Mr. STRAUSS. Mr. Hosmer, there is no satisfaction in being proved right on circumstances as grim as those we face.

We faithfully observed our commitments, stopping testing nuclear weapons from the autumn of 1958 until after the Russians violated the moratorium in September 1961. Even after that violation took place it took us until the spring of the following year to get our tests started again. I am very worried about the present situation. We will be headed into the same kind of imprudent commitments if, at every time the Russians agree to talk, we call our test programs off. I was very glad to note that the underground testing program had been reinstated last week. While the Russian people undoubtedly want atomic disarmament as much as we do, we ought to know by now that a promise by the Soviet Government is worthless. This has been demonstrated time after time but seems to make no impression here. It is less than 4 months since the President told us that the Soviet emissaries who called to see him at the White House last fall had attempted flatly to deceive him about Cuba. What possible sense is there in risking our safety on anything they say?

Mr. HOSMER. You say "risking our safety": What exactly do you mean by that?

Mr. STRAUSS. The testing of nuclear weapons is necessary to the improvement of those weapons. We need constantly to improve our nuclear arsenals so that we will be strong in the future as we have been in the past—so strong that an aggressor will be discouraged from attacking us. It has been frequently stated that further testing is unnecessary because weapons cannot be further improved. This was first said years ago, and it is often repeated, but it has often been proved untrue, time and again. The Soviets in their test series in 1961 exploded weapons which demonstrated development in size, if nothing else. The 3-year moratorium worked greatly to their advantage and to our disadvantage.

Furthermore, as it is known that we will not be the first to attack with atomic weapons, it follows that we will be first on the receiving end of an atomic war. Our stockpile must be larger because we may lose part of it in an attack, and our weapons must be more precise because they will be needed to block an attack that has already been launched.

Some of our weapons will also need to be clean, that is to say, free from fallout, as they may have to be exploded high above our own or friendly territory to destroy enemy missiles already launched at targets in our own country. Test suspension arrests the development of these weapons. This is a severe setback for us, not the Soviets.

Every time we improve the missiles which carry our weapons, we absolutely must test them with atomic warheads to be sure that they work together as an effective system. At our peril, we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you regard the reported easing of the Soviet objection of onsite inspection as a hopeful sign?

Mr. STRAUSS. I saw the report that the Russians had offered three on-site inspections and that this was regarded as a great breakthrough. It is not new. The Soviets proposed the same thing in 1960, and it was totally inadequate then. There are many hundreds of seismic events in the Russian land mass each year. Any of which could be the result of a clandestine weapons test. To be offered the opportunity to inspect three of the many hundreds is meaningless as a safeguard against cheating. Indeed, I am fearful of a compromise at a slightly larger number than three, but still an insignificant number. The figure 10 has been mentioned. In my opinion that would be completely inadequate.

Mr. HOSMER. What about the so-called tamperproof black boxes?

Mr. STRAUSS. There is no such thing as a tamperproof detection device and nothing can take the place of unhampered, on-site inspection by an international team on which our own people would be adequately represented.

Mr. HOSMER. Why do you think we are susceptible to all this pressure to stop our weapons development?

Mr. STRAUSS. Because so many people have been misled into a vast fear of the effect of fallout from nuclear tests. The fallout which would be the result of a nuclear war would be a fearsome thing. The very purpose of our strong weapons posture is to prevent a nuclear war. We test to keep that posture strong. The fallout from tests and the fallout from nuclear war are totally different in magnitude and effect.

There are also a large number of people who think that an agreement to stop testing is equivalent to nuclear disarmament. This, of course, is not true. Indeed, it is a dangerous misconception because it gives a false sense of security.

Naturally, the Russians want us to stop testing. The moratorium was of incalculable value to them. We must not fall into that terrible error again.

CONGRESS A BULWARK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I resent Roscoe Drummond's article in this week's Saturday Evening Post. His thesis is that